

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.2100 of 2007

Date: 06.02.2007

Between:

S.Chandra Mohan and others.

....Petitioners

And

The Sub-Registrar, Singarayakonda, Prakasam District and another.

....Respondents

-
-
-
-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

-
WRIT PETITION No.2100 of 2007

-
O R D E R:

-
Petitioners are the sons of second respondent. The latter executed a deed of settlement, dated 27.12.2001, in favour of the petitioners, in respect of various items of property. Recently, on 17.01.2007, the second respondent is said to have executed a deed of revocation on 17.01.2007 and the said document was registered by the first respondent. The petitioners challenge the action of the first respondent in accepting the document presented by the second respondent for registration.

Sri V.Rajagopal Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that valuable rights have accrued to his clients under the deed of settlement and the same could not have been taken away unilaterally by the second respondent. He contends that the first respondent ought not to have registered the document.

From the point of view of accrual and divestment of rights, on account of transfer of immovable properties, the contention of the learned counsel appears to be acceptable. However, in the context of permissibility of executing deeds of revocation of sale deeds and other deeds of transfer as well as the obligation of the registering authority to accept the same, the dispute is no longer *res integra*. I n ***Yanala Malleshwari vs. Ananthula Sayamma***^[1], a Full Bench of this Court held that the only remedy open to an aggrieved party, in such cases, is to file a suit for cancellation of the deed of revocation.

Hence, the Writ Petition is disposed of, leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies, in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

JSU

06.02.2007

^[1] 2006 (6) ALD 623 (FB)